DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 233 710 IR 020 000

TITLE	Report on the Leadership Development Forum for Educational Technology (Palo Alto, California, November 10, 1982).
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, San Francisco, Calif. Region 9.
PUB DATE	10 Nov 82
NOTE	29p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Change Strategies; Clearinghouses; Curriculum Development; *Educational Needs; *Educational Technology; Elementary Secondary Education; Financial Support; Position Papers; Publicity; Staff Development; Statewide Planning

ABSTRACT

Six critical educational technology (ET) needs in California were identified at the first of two forums held in California in the summer of 1982. The six needs are: (1) state and local planning: coordination and cooperation across the state; (2) public awareness of technology literacy issues; (3) adequate funding for planning and implementation of ET; (4) new view of curriculum development and instruction incorporating technology; (5) staff development; and (6) creation of an ET clearinghouse. A second forum, Leadership Development Forum for Educational Technology, was held to plan strategies for meeting these needs. Conference attendees broke into six groups to discuss ideas and suggestions for meeting these needs. Reports from each of these groups and a list of participants at both conferences conclude the document. (CW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED233710

REPORT ON THE LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT FORUM FOR EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

November 10, 1982

Palo Alto, California

Sponsored by:

United States Department of Education, Region IX Office

California School Boards Association

California State Department of Education

Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development

IR020000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

TABLE 1 - IDENTIFIED NEEDS: SIX MOST CRITICAL EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY NEEDS IN CALIFORNIA 4

PROPOSED STRATEGIES 5

State and Local Planning 5

Public Awareness 6

Adequate Funding 8

New View of Curriculum Development 9

Staff Development 13

Educational Technology Clearinghouse 15

FINAL COMMENTS 16

APPENDIX A: PARTICIPANTS LIST

INVITATIONAL FORUM FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF COORDINATED REGIONAL LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

California has a wide variety of human, technological, educational, and organizational resources that potentially can help to keep the technological revolution up-to-date in the schools. Recognizing the need to encourage and coordinate this process, educational leaders in the state sponsored an invitational forum in July 1982 at the Association of California School Administrators headquarters in Burlingame. Its purpose was to identify the most critical needs for educational technology and to discuss possible strategies for meeting those needs.

Six critical educational technology needs were identified by this group. To provide an important opportunity to plan strategies for meeting these needs, the U.S. Department of Education, the California State Department of Education, the California School Boards Association, and Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development jointly sponsored the Leadership Forum on Educational Technology on November 10, 1982. Members of educational agencies and organizations from California and the other states in Region IX participated. Appendix A contains a list of the individuals and their agencies.

The starting point of the second forum, held at the Hewlett-Packard Corporate Training Office in Palo Alto, was the list of six high priority concerns. Those issues and outcomes of the first forum, coupled with the results of the U.S. Department of Education's Technology Conferencing in June 1982, and the expressed needs of the states comprising Region IX, gave additional impetus to the commitment of the cosponsoring agencies.

The day began with remarks from Dr. Eugene Gonzales, Secretary's Regional Representative, U.S. Department of Education, and Mr. Terry Gildey, Hewlett Packard's Director of Technical Training. Dr. Gonzales stressed the need for a plan implementing educational technology in the schools. California, with its abundant technology resources, is the most likely state to be able to develop a model which other states and school districts might emulate. He told the conference attendees that he would share the results of the day's meeting with Secretary of Education T.H. Bell, who has a special interest in this area.

Mr. Gildey focused his remarks on the need for a technologically-aware public and the role schools can play in preparing students for technological change. New job categories require advanced technological skills and knowledge, he remarked, and schools should keep pace with these developments. Technology issues are increasingly intertwined with economic and social issues, raising the need for an informed electorate. In addition, education is becoming a continuing process, leading to the development of

adult education and employee training programs. While technology has caused us problems, Gildey believes it has also provided solutions. Our students will need to know how technology can be harnessed to solve, rather than create, problems in the future.

After the opening remarks, conference attendees broke into small groups, which focused on one of the six needs identified at the July meeting. Following are the ideas and suggestions the six, small groups reported.

TABLE 1

IDENTIFIED NEEDS: SIX CRITICAL EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY NEEDS IN CALIFORNIA

A. State and Local Planning: Coordination and Cooperation Across the State

- Budgets
- Facilities
- Research
- Instruction

B. Public Awareness of Technology Literacy Issues

- Includes teachers, students, and parents
- Requires standards and definitions of technology literacy

C. Adequate Funding for Planning and Implementation of Educational Technology

D. New View of Curriculum Development and Instruction Incorporating Technology

- Integrating courseware into curriculum planning
- Developing basic academic skills through use of technology
- Coordinating across academic disciplines

E. Staff Development

- Pre- and in-service training
- Elementary, secondary, and higher education levels

F. Educational Technology Clearinghouse

- Information
- Research and courseware development
- Courseware evaluation

PROPOSED STRATEGIES

State and Local Planning

Planning is an essential step in the implementation of technology in the schools. According to this group, much can be learned from the successes and failures that other state and local educators have experienced. Plans for new curricula and teaching tools must be designed to meet each district's own educational needs and goals.

Educators who are planning statewide and local programs should first make use of existing resources, drawing on such programs as the regional Teacher Education/Computer (TEC) Centers for assistance. TEC Centers, for example, might provide the facilities and personnel to train trainers who can then conduct workshops for local school districts.

Existing ideas and programs might be adapted to serve new groups. Cited as examples were the in-service training/planning model developed by California TEC Center Region VIII and being implemented in San Jose, California; interactive video and ITV to disseminate educational technology instruction; programs for cable television channels to facilitate community awareness and dialogue on planning issues; and industry's in-service training programs to serve educators' needs.

A variety of new strategies for state and local planning also exist. These include information-sharing via interpersonal and electronic networks; a statewide newsletter; using satellites, cable

television, and electronic bulletin boards to transmit data that can facilitate planning efforts; developing a document to help LEAs plan, develop, implement, and evaluate programs; and establishing a statewide foundation, supported by California's high-technology industries, which would fund staff development, equipment acquisition, and curriculum innovation.

The group recognized that coordinated, statewide planning can be cost efficient because existing resources can be consolidated and/or catalogued for later access or dissemination. Information can also be gathered and published in one central place for subsequent distribution. The group suggested two publications, a monthly newsletter about planning issues and a document to help school districts with their planning efforts.

Finally, the group stressed the importance of business/industry participation in educational planning. Their participation can help sensitize educators to industry's skill requirements for new employees and can show industry representatives how they might contribute personnel and resources to best serve the schools.

Public Awareness of Technology Literacy Issues

The group that discussed public awareness outlined current activities in this area. They also delineated needs and strategies for meeting those needs.

Currently, the California State Department of Education's Educational Technology Unit is involved in programs that are helping

to increase educators' and the public's awareness of technology. For example, staff members are involved in a task force and advisory committee that support the implementation of computers in education. They are helping local and county districts with educational technology planning; assisting the development of instructional radio; working with TEC Centers in planning and program development; helping with software evaluation; and facilitating group purchasing of equipment.

Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development has an electronic bulletin board for educators across the state. It provides workshops in technology for educational decision makers and a computer-based information retrieval service called Technology Information for Educators (TIE). The Laboratory also publishes a newsletter, entitled **ETC: Educational Technology & Communication**, written for school decision makers.

The National Congress of Parents and Teachers Association (PTA) is developing national guidelines in educational technology. On a statewide level, it has organized an Educational Technology Committee to increase public awareness of available resources and to help schools make policy decisions when utilizing new technologies.

The U.S. Department of Education, a co-sponsor of the November Leadership Development Forum, is also committed to supporting a technology effort. Among other plans, it will disseminate the forum proceedings on a national and Region IX level.

In addition to identifying existing activities, the group identified four major needs. These were 1) increased public awareness

of the wide variety of uses and implications for technology in education, such as for instruction and school management, for students' psychological development, and for students' development of critical viewing skills; 2) sharing and networking within and among states; 3) equal access to technology and instruction about technology; and 4) recognition of the importance of planning whenever technology is introduced into the curriculum. Strategies for meeting these needs include in-service training; writing articles that address the needs; tying into existing public awareness efforts in the state, including the materials and activities sponsored by computer companies; networking; and statewide and interstate conferences.

Adequate Funding for Planning and Implementation of Educational Technology

This group's main concern was statewide coordination of efforts to secure funding. Centralizing funding efforts, they believed, would help to avoid the "nickel and dime" syndrome that local school districts face when seeking funds for special projects. The TEC Centers, for example, might serve as clearinghouses for funding, with support from California Assembly Bill 2190.

Sources of funding include the Federal and state governments, corporations, and foundations. A centralized, coordinated group whose main job is to secure funding, perhaps housed at an educational technology clearinghouse, can be responsible for requesting

corporate grants, responding to RFPs (requests for proposals), and conceiving of new ways to attract and utilize contributions to technology education. This group might also advocate the implementation of legislation granting tax incentives to corporations that donate personnel time, equipment, and other resources to the schools. In addition, the funding group can serve as a liaison with current funders and donors to let them know how their contributions are being used in California education, and to encourage their continued support.

New View of Curriculum Development and Instruction Incorporating Technology

Technology is changing the curriculum, including what is taught and how it is taught. This group discussed **new curriculum topics** that are vital in the technological age, such as computer literacy and critical viewing skills, and **new uses of technology in education** to teach traditional subjects. Computers, telecommunications, radio, new media for recording and playback, interconnecting media that allow from schoolwide to worldwide networking, data management and text retrieval systems, and other technological tools are changing the way teachers teach. They need assistance to incorporate these changing technologies into the curriculum, and a statewide effort that can draw on substantial financial and personnel resources may be the most effective way to meet this goal. An

educational technology clearinghouse may be the best location for a group concerned with technology in the curriculum.

Research is needed to identify existing exemplary programs that might serve as models for future curriculum planning. Alaska, for example, has a satellite for educational television programming and communication between educators. California and other states can learn from Alaska's experience. In addition, research is needed to evaluate new curriculum materials and teaching methods before they are implemented in the schools and during pilot implementation. Published evaluation reports will be useful to other educators who are considering similar purchases or training programs.

On a grass-roots level, many California school districts are now utilizing technology in innovative and productive ways. Other states in Region IX also show promise in their technology effort. In order not to inhibit their progress, the educational technology curriculum group should coordinate, not dictate, guidelines for educators in each subject area to help them integrate technology into their curricula. Such guidelines could suggest ways that English teachers can familiarize students with word processing techniques in tandem with their development of writing skills. The guidelines might help social studies teachers who are looking for readings and class activities to teach critical viewing skills when their classes examine economics, consumer education, or socialization and family life. The educational-technology curriculum group can provide teaching ideas and information about resources for

teacher training and materials acquisition, research results that validate the effectiveness of selected curriculum materials, and a basic list of guidelines for teachers who want to incorporate technology as a subject, or technology as a tool, in the classroom.

Public information is another area in which the educational-technology curriculum group can work. They might produce publications and community events to encourage greater understanding and acceptance of technology in education. These activities can focus attention on the issues, encourage participation and dialogue, legitimize the use of technology for teaching, and facilitate the implementation of new curricula in the schools. A basic theme of their efforts should be, "Technology is for Everybody." Technology is as basic a tool as books, paper, and pencil, and an educated person in the 1980's needs to be conversant with as many tools as possible. Knowing how to use technology also means knowing how and when it should not be used. It cannot solve all teaching and learning problems and it cannot substitute for all traditional teaching methods.

Finally, in the 1980's students need to receive technology consumer education. As citizens, they will be voting on local cable television franchise decisions, allocating their leisure time to a variety of new amusements and entertainments, raising their children to be technology consumers, purchasing computer and television equipment for home and office, receiving their news from new information sources, and potentially gaining or losing their right to

choose what kinds of programming are available from media sources ranging from computer game arcades to public television stations. A statewide educational technology curriculum group can be a catalyst encouraging educators to teach and motivate their students to be active and well-informed technology consumers.

Five strategies for addressing the above needs were outlined. They were:

1) **Formation of a research group.** With adequate funding, this group can gather and compile information on long-range developments in educational technology and evaluate and examine the potential of satellites, interconnects, and other forms of technology that might be used on a statewide level to facilitate communication.

2) **Formation of a clearinghouse.** A clearinghouse can facilitate the integration of educational technology into the curriculum, publish newsletters, conduct curriculum evaluations, disseminate information about successful educational programs and materials, and answer educators' questions about curriculum and teaching.

3) **Staff and community education.** Workshops, community events, and training sessions geared to educators, students, parents, policy makers, and the community at large can encourage acceptance of technology in the school curriculum. Information dissemination and public-relations efforts will speed up this

process and will help people make informed decisions about technology use. This work can be conducted through the clearinghouse.

4) **Dialogue with industry.** ndustry can be an active, visible, and powerful advocate for technology in education. Dialogue between educators and private-sector representatives is needed.

5) **System of communication between educators.** Information sharing between California educators and those in other states in Region IX can be handled centrally, and all technologies ranging from ditto machines and telephones to satellite-assisted teleconferencing and computer networks can be used to link educators with common problems, interests, and ideas.

Staff Development

Staff development is a key factor determining the successful implementation of technology in education. Training, direct services to individual teachers, hardware and software availability, and administrative support should be closely related to teachers' actual classroom needs. For example, many educators are concentrating on teaching basic skills. If new technology is introduced that is well designed to help them meet their curricular goals and if

they are trained to use this technology competently, they will be likely to embrace it and incorporate it into their teaching.

School-district support for and commitment to new technologies in the classroom and staff training will speed up the process of change. The school district might provide salary incentives and in-service training sessions to help teachers explore new technologies for the classroom. Career-education teachers and guidance counselors should be supplied with materials describing career options in high technology fields, and the schools should have resources to help students pursue their interests in these areas.

Some resources for schools include the Teacher Education Computer (TEC) Centers of California, the State Department of Education, outside consultants, universities, the organizations represented at the Leadership Development Forums (see Appendix A), students who can tutor other students, and private industry. Staff training can be facilitated through networking, using mobile vans containing equip- ment teachers might want to learn about and eventually use, peer training, conferences, summer and after-school sessions, and instructional television programs. The California Writing Project and the Minnesota Educational Computing Consortium (MECC) model were cited as exemplary teacher training programs worthy of adapting to specific staff development needs.

Quality control of staff development may be a problem for some school districts. To alleviate this potential hazard, central agencies such as an educational-technology clearinghouse can train

trainers and design high quality training materials, thus making good training available to all school districts throughout the state. Pre-service training is also needed, so an active dialogue between educators and teacher training institutions is necessary.

Educational Technology Clearinghouse

The groups discussing the five major educational technology needs listed above (planning, public awareness, funding, curriculum, and staff development) envisioned a centralized organization to serve these needs statewide. With it, educators would know that there was one place that could help them locate resources, assisttance, referrals to local facilities and consultants, funding, training, and answers to questions. This organization would be the primary state recipient and disseminator of information pertaining to educational technology. It could house a library covering topics such as software, equipment, curriculum materials, administration, staff development, grants, exemplary educational programs, research and evaluation, industry resources, statewide educator networking, community events, and legislation. The clearinghouse would be responsive to educators' needs, serving as support for their local projects, and would propose new ideas that educators might want to try. Some organizations are now fulfilling some of the roles a clearinghouse might serve, so their services might be incorporated into the clearinghouse.

FINAL COMMENTS FROM FORUM PARTICIPANTS

Upon concluding the day-long forum, participants wrote down comments evaluating the meeting and stating whether they intended to work with their organizations to address any of the educational technology needs that had been identified. Comments were favorable. Participants frequently praised the emphasis put on finding "workable strategies," "action items," and "specifics" to meet educational technology needs. A few participants, however, criticized the forum for not focusing enough attention on specific planning.

The vast majority agreed that the conference provided an opportunity to meet face-to-face with educational leaders who share common concerns and goals. This permitted idea sharing and the chance to discuss informally the ways organizations might work together.

Participants' plans for the future covered the range of topics addressed in the meetings. These included developing task forces on technology at the state and local levels, encouraging and providing staff development and training for teachers, disseminating information on educational technology, and pursuing the idea for an educational-technology clearinghouse. Some of their specific comments were:

- "Call for papers from colleagues to stimulate further action planning in educational technology."
- "Work with a curriculum commission on adoption of computer-education specifications."

- "Develop links with industry."
- Parents and other community members to assist with school leadership activities."
- "Sponsor a computer literacy day at my agency's annual conference."
- "Work to develop a curriculum base."
- "Write articles for educators outlining criteria for selecting and purchasing equipment."
- "Seek and support legislation that will provide funding and equal access to technology for all children."
- "Most helpful was meeting and working with people."
- "Sharing of ideas."
- "Discussion with people/agencies on mutual problems."

The Leadership Development Forum brought together a diverse group of educational decision makers who represented a wide range of constituents, yet who shared common interests and goals. The six, idea-generating discussion groups developed strategies for meeting the states educational technology needs including planning, public awareness of technology issues, adequate funding, curriculum development and implementation of technology in the schools, staff development, and an educational technology clearinghouse. Participants praised the conference for its emphasis on finding workable, realistic solutions to these needs, and many have taken the initiative to report back to their own agencies, implement new programs based on the ideas generated at the conference, and devote

their organizations' resources to exploring further ways to bring the technological revolution to California, Arizona, Nevada, Hawaii, and Pacific Basin citizens and their schools.

APPENDIX A: PARTICIPANTS LIST

PARTICIPANT LIST

INVITATIONAL FORUM ON EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

NOVEMBER 10, 1982

PARTICIPANT

Richard Altimari
Dir. of Curriculum, Petaluma School Dist.
11 Fifth Street
Petaluma, CA 94952

* Nancy Baumann
** California School Boards Association
916 - 23rd Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Warren Bell
114 Grover Lane
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Duan M. Bjerke
U.S. Department of Education Region IX
50 United Nations Plaza, Room 211
San Francisco, CA 94102

* Donna Bolen
** State Department of Education
Educational Technology Unit
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814

** Harriet Borson
California State Parent Teachers Association
930 Georgia Street
Los Angeles, CA 90015

* Carroll Bravo
** State Department of Education
Educational Technology Unit
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814

** Carol Burton
State Department of Education
Deputy Superintendent's Office
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814

* Matilda Butler
** Edupro
P O Box 51346
Palo Alto, CA 94303

** John Cambus
California Curriculum Correlating Council
Department of Mass Communication
California State University, Hayward
Hayward, CA 94542

** Phil Dar.
State Department of Education
Deputy Superintendent's Office
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814

** Barbara DeCaro
*** American Electronics Association
2680 Hanover Street
Palo Alto, CA 94304

** Joe Duardo
California School Boards Association
South Whittier School District
13444 Safari Drive
Whittier, CA 90620

** C. Hugh Friedman
*** State Board of Education
University of San Diego School of Law
Alcala Park
San Diego, CA 92110

Terry L. Gildea
Information Systems Functional Manager
Hewlett-Packard Company
1819 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304

Eugene Gonzales
U.S. Department of Education, Region IX
50 United Nations Plaza
San Francisco, CA 94102

** Bobby Goodson
Computer Using Educators
1666 Kitchener Drive
Sunnyvale, CA 94087

** Mark Gorelczenko
KOCE-TV
P O Box 2476
Huntington Beach, CA 92647

* Stu Greenfeld
** State Department of Education
Curriculum Services
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814

** Marilyn Hammond
*** Association for California School Administrators
1575 Old Bayshore Highway
Burlingame, CA 94010

Mary Hardy
Alameda County Board of Education
224 West Winton Avenue
Hayward, CA 94544

** Dale Heckman
*** California Postsecondary Education Commission
1020 - 12th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Virgil S. Hollis
Marin County Superintendent of Schools
1111 Las Gallinas Avenue
San Rafael, CA 94903

** Robert House
*** Association for California School Administrators
1575 Old Bayshore Highway
Burlingame, CA 94010

X Gordon Hughan
272 La Cruz Avenue
Milbrae, CA 94030

** John W. Hunt
*** State Steering Committee for Curriculum
Development and Publication
Los Angeles County Office of Education
9300 E. Imperial Highway
Downey, CA 90242

* Lynn Jenks
** Technical Assistance and Dissemination Div.
*** Far West Laboratory for Ed Research & Dvlpmt.
1855 Folsom Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

** Robert Kane
Commission for Teacher Preparation & Licensing
1020 'O' Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

** Don Lundstrom
Curriculum Development and Supplemental
Materials Commission (Chairperson)
Pajaro Valley Unified School District
440-A Arthur Road
Watsonville, CA 95076

** Debra Lieberman
683 Live Oak Ave., Apt.# 4
Menlo Park, CA 94025

** Hazel Mahone
California School Boards Association
916 - 23rd Street
Sacramento, CA 95816

Jean Marzone
Technical Assistance and Dissemination Div.
Far West Laboratory for Ed Research & Dvlpmt.
1855 Folsom Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

** J. William May
State Department of Education
Office of Curriculum Services
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814

X Michael McEvoy
Superintendent
Alexander Valley School District
8511 Highway 128
Healdsburg, CA 95448

* Lewis Miller
** Technical Assistance and Dissemination Div.
Far West Laboratory for Ed Research & Dvlpmt.
1855 Folsom Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

X Maurice Mitchell
National Public Radio
1518 Alameda Pagre Serra
Santa Barbara, CA 93103

X Judith Moses
(C. Hargett Elem. School)
12150 Grovedale Drive
Whittier, CA 90604

** John Muir
California Teachers Association
1705 Murchison Drive
Burlingame, CA 94010

Renato Nicolai
Institute of Computer Technology
1196 Lime Drive
Sunnyvale, CA 94087

Judy Norberg
Association for CA School Administrators
Piedmont Unified School District
760 Magnolia Avenue
Piedmont, CA 94611

** William Paisley
*** Edupro
P O Box 51346
Palo Alto, CA 94303

* Albert Piltz
U.S. Department of Education, Region IX
50 United Nations Plaza
San Francisco, CA 94102

* Mary Reed
** State Department of Education
Educational Technology Unit
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814

John Rumkel
U.S. Department of Education, Region VIII
1961 Stout Street
Denver, CO 90202

Tom Sachse
State Department of Education
Office of Staff Development
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814

Brian Sakai
Computer Using Educators
P O Box 18547
San Jose, CA 95158

X Richard E. Schutz
Southwest Regional Laboratory
4665 Lampson Avenue
Los Alamitos, CA 90720

** Jean Sims
Technical Assistance and Dissemination Div.
Far West Laboratory for Ed Research & Dvlpmt.
1855 Folsom Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

** Colin Sprang
*** CA Association of Independent Schools
25 Academy Road, Palos Verdes Penninsula 90274
MAIL TO: 3065 Jackson Street
San Francisco, CA 94115

** Robert Stahl
*** California Teachers Association
1705 Murchison Drive
Burlingame, CA 94010

** Sally Stewart
California School Boards Association
916 - 23rd Street
Sacramento, CA 95816

** Jack Stoltz
*** State Instructional Television Advisory Committee
Santa Barbara County Schools
4400 Cathedral Oaks Road
Santa Barbara, CA 93111

X Mildred Thompson
State Department of Education
Vocational Education Unit
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814

X David L. Viar
California Community College Trustees Assn.
1001 'G' Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

X Sandy Wagner
Computer Using Educators
P O Box 18547
San Jose, CA 95158

Frank Wallis
State Department of Education
Computer Education Unit
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814

Peter Wang
State Department of Education
Computer Education Unit
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814

** Henry Weiss
*** Industry Education Council of California
1575 Old Bayshore Highway
Burlingame, CA 94010

Beverly Wheeler
2152 East Apollo Avenue
Tempe, AZ 85283

** Forrest Williams
California School Boards Association
Oak Grove School District
6578 Santa Teresa Blvd.
San Jose, CA 95123

Participants List/Invitational Forum on Educational Technology

Shareen Young
Institute of Computer Technology
114 Grover Lane
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Rodger Layng (videotaped session)
Daystar Communications
2240 East Side Road
Talmage, CA 95481

---

* Member, Planning Committee

** Attended 7/14/83 Forum

*** Did not attend 11/10/82 Forum

X Invited, did not attend Forum